

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 * * *

4 BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 THE VILLAS COMMUNITY
8 ASSOCIATION, *et al.*,

9 Defendants.

Case No. 2:16-cv-00516-APG-VCF

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
RECONSIDER AND GRANTING
MOTION TO STRIKE**

(ECF Nos. 35, 36)

10 Plaintiff/counterdefendant Bank of America, N.A. requested the court require
11 defendant/counterclaimant SFR Investments Pool 1, LLC to post a cost bond pursuant to Nevada
12 Revised Statutes § 18.130(1). I granted that motion. ECF No. 34. SFR now moves for
13 reconsideration and to strike the request for security costs, arguing that § 18.130(1) does not
14 apply because SFR is not a plaintiff and SFR is a Nevada limited liability company that resides in
15 Nevada.

16 Under § 18.130(1), “[w]hen a plaintiff in an action resides out of the State, or is a foreign
17 corporation, security for the costs and charges which may be awarded against such plaintiff may
18 be required by the defendant, by the filing and service on plaintiff of a written demand therefor
19 within the time limited for answering the complaint.” The statute thus applies to out-of-state
20 plaintiffs, of which SFR is neither. SFR is a defendant in this case. And, SFR is a Nevada
21 limited liability company that resides in Nevada. *See* ECF Nos. 1 at 2 and 27 at 2 (alleging and
22 admitting that SFR is a Nevada limited liability company); 49-1 (deposition testimony that SFR
23 operates only in Nevada).¹ The fact that SFR’s members may be citizens of other states for
24

25
26 ¹ *See also* the Nevada Secretary of State website identifying SFR as a Nevada limited liability
27 company with registered agent and officer addresses in Nevada.
28 <https://nvsos.gov/SOSEntitySearch/CorpDetails.aspx?lx8nvq=enkrPI2ZQISNORkAAyF%252fAw%253d%253d&nt7=0> (last accessed on August 3, 2016).

1 purposes of determining diversity jurisdiction under federal law does not change SFR's residency
2 or status as a Nevada limited liability company for purposes of the Nevada statute.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant/counterclaimant SFR Investments Pool 1,
4 LLC's motion for reconsideration (**ECF No. 35**) is **GRANTED**.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant/counterclaimant SFR Investments Pool 1,
6 LLC's motion to strike (**ECF No. 36**) is **GRANTED**.

7 DATED this 3rd day of August, 2016.



8
9 ANDREW P. GORDON
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28